

DENVER, CO 80202

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/042,731 12/21/2000 John Bullock IQN0001 8862 25235 7590 **EXAMINER** 04/24/2006 **HOGAN & HARTSON LLP** DESHPANDE, KALYAN K ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 ART UNIT 1200 SEVENTEENTH ST PAPER NUMBER

> 3623 DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)
BULLOCK ET AL.
Art Unit
3623

	Raiyan R. Deshpande	3023	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70		ET INOT INC. ET WATOT	ILLD WITTING
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		.at	Ales income for
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	eaucing or simplifying	tne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	iected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	,	,	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate,	-	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	t hafara ar an tha data of filing a hi	lation of Annual will be	t be entered
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	
13. Other:		a de	12.
		TARIO R. H	
		SUPERVISORY PATER	IT EXAMINER
		TECHNOLOGY CEN	ITER 3600

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's argument Kurzius et al. and Joao fail to teach profiles with restricted portions and using restricted portions for matching, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Joao teaches restricted data for use by the external matching engine in obtaining a match for the data record (Joao: col. 14, line 61 to col. 15, line 10, and col. 23, lines 35-52). Joao teaches the use of generic terms to conceal and/or suggest attributes rather than using actual values. By using generic terms, the user is restricting hiring agents from obtaining the actual terms without the user's consent. Upon a showing of interest by a hiring agent, the user can avail the specific details. Use of generic data serves the same functionality as restricting data in that both do not disclose data the user does not wish to disclose. Additionally, the matching is done based on the information the user provides. User has the ability to set forth similar data for matching such that the matching is not affected. The example provided by Joao describes a user entering "Ivy League School" rather than entering a specific Ivy League school. This information is true information and affects the matching engine the same. Per the example provided by Applicants, a user may submit data such as "Harvard" and the matching engine will use this data for searches. If the user does not wish to submit this data, the user can put "Ivy League School" and the matching engine will still use this data for matching but will match to search requests for "Harvard". The advantage restricting data from other users is that it allows for a user to not have to disclose sensitive data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of using generic data to the Kurzius et al. system in order to allow users to maintain a level of confidentiality, which is a goal of Joao (Joao: col. 2 line 62 to col. 3 line 8).